

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 23, 2008. Claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 14 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10, and 11 are in independent form. Claim 12 has been cancelled hereby, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 11, 13, and 14 have been amended to define aspects of Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. In response, the title has been amended to recite: "INFORMATION PROCESSING APPARATUS AND CONNECTION CONTROL METHOD FOR JOINING A WIRELESS NETWORK." Applicant respectfully submits that the title, as amended, is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The Office Action objected to Claim 3 because it depended from cancelled Claim 2. In response, Claim 3 has been amended to depend from Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to Claim 3.

Claims 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Cancellation of Claim 12 renders its rejection moot. Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended Claim 11, as deemed necessary, to ensure that it conforms fully to the requirements of Section 101, with special attention to the points raised in section 7 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 101, has been obviated and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 3, and 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0003060

(*Asoh et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0029531 (*Ohta*); and that Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Asoh et al.* in view of *Ohta* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,465 (*Suda et al.*). Cancellation of Claim 12 renders its rejection moot. Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 10, and 11, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a connection control method for an information processing apparatus. The control method includes: (1) a reception step of receiving identification information for identifying each wireless network of a plurality of wireless networks; (2) a first joining step of wirelessly joining a wireless network identified by the identification information received in the reception step; (3) a detection step of inquiring, of other information processing apparatuses in the wirelessly joined wireless network, whether the other information processing apparatuses are capable of performing a predetermined processing, and, based on a positive inquiry response, detecting another information processing apparatus capable of performing the predetermined processing; (4) a request step of requesting the predetermined processing from the other information processing apparatus, if the other information processing apparatus is detected in the detection step; and (5) a second joining step of joining another wireless network identified by the identification information received in the reception step, if another information processing apparatus is not detected in the detection step, wherein the detection step is executed again in the wireless network joined in the second joining step and the request step is executed in accordance with a result of the detection step.

Notable features of Claim 1 include “a request step of requesting the predetermined processing from the other information processing apparatus, if the other information processing apparatus is detected in the detection step” and “a second joining step of joining another wireless network identified by the identification information received in the reception step, if another information processing apparatus is not detected in the detection step, wherein the detection step is executed again in the wireless network joined in the second joining step and the request step is executed in accordance with a result of the detection step.” By virtue of these features, when an information processing apparatus joins a network and no other information processing apparatus in the network is capable of performing a desired printing function, the information processing apparatus joins another network to detect another information processing apparatus capable of performing the desired printing function, for example.¹

Asoh et al. relates to a computer connected to a plurality of networks. Apparently, *Asoh et al.* teaches that the computer scans a signal transmitted from an access point to detect a service set identifier (SSID) of the access point, and that the computer joins a wireless network corresponding to the detected SSID. *Asoh et al.* discusses that, when the computer detects two or more SSID's, the computer joins a wireless network corresponding to a SSID with a priority that has been set previously to a higher value, and that, when the wireless network is disconnected, the computer detects another SSID and joins a wireless network corresponding to the other SSID. As best understood by Applicant, *Asoh et al.* is silent regarding requesting a

¹ The example(s) presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes only. Any details presented in the illustrative example(s) should not be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

predetermined processing from another computer. Moreover, *Asoh et al.* is silent regarding joining another network based on a response to a request for the predetermined processing.

Ohta relates to a system for printing information at a conveniently located printer station that is selected in a predetermined area. Apparently, *Ohta* teaches that a portable device transmits an inquiry signal, a printer transmits a response to the inquiry signal, the portable device wirelessly connects with the printer, and that the printer prints image data received from the portable device. As best understood, *Ohta* is silent regarding joining another network based on a response to a request for a predetermined processing.

Suda et al. relates to an information processing apparatus that is connected to another device. *Suda et al.* discusses transferring a job from a first device to a second device when it is recognized that the first device cannot execute the job. *Suda et al.* is silent regarding joining another network based on a response to a request for a predetermined processing.

Applicant submits that a combination of *Asoh et al.*, *Ohta*, and *Suda et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest “a request step of requesting the predetermined processing from the other information processing apparatus, if the other information processing apparatus is detected in the detection step” and “a second joining step of joining another wireless network identified by the identification information received in the reception step, if another information processing apparatus is not detected in the detection step, wherein the detection step is executed again in the wireless network joined in the second joining step and the request step is executed in accordance with a result of the detection step,” as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over the *Asoh et al.* and *Ohta*, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 10 and 11 include features similar to those discussed above. Therefore, those claims also are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/
Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 2504471v1